

REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 7, 2007 in which Claims 1-23 were rejected. With this response, claims 1 and 19 are amended. Claims 1-23 overcome the rejections and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 USC 102(b) based upon Kahn

The Office Action rejected claims 1-23 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kahn US Patent 6,401,079. Claim 19 is amended. For the reasons which follow, the rejection of claims 1-23 should be withdrawn.

A. Claims 1, 18 and 20

Claims 1, 18 and 20 each recite moving a selector between each only plurality of fields including a start field, a stop field, a description field and at least one code field. Each of claims 1, 18 and 20 additionally recite performing at least one of a plurality of functions based upon which of the plurality of fields the selector is located and in response to actuation of an actuator.

Kahn fails to disclose a time entry recording and management system or a method wherein a selector is movable between each of the claimed fields and wherein at least one of a plurality of functions is performed upon actuation of an actuator depending upon which of the plurality of fields a selector is located.

In contrast, Kahn merely discloses a web based payroll and benefits administration which offers multiple interface screens. Nowhere does Ryne disclose at lease one code field configured to display at lease one code assigned to the time entry. In fact, the Office Action fails to even address this limitation. The Office Action refers to Figure 12(a) of Kahn as allegedly disclosing a time entry. However, nowhere does Figure 12(a) illustrate a code field displaying at least one code assigned to the time entry.

Moreover, nowhere does Ryne disclose an actuator that is configured to perform at least one of a plurality of functions upon being actuated depending upon in which of the plurality of fields the selector is located. In attempting to read Kahn upon this limitation, the Office Action refers to column 13, line 58-67 of Kahn. However, decided portion of Kahn says nothing about an actuator that performs a function depending upon which of the plurality of fields the selector is located. In contrast, the Porsche Kahn cited by the office action merely discloses that a user may program a customized sequence of interface screens which can be invoked with a keystroke or clicking a button. In other words, a user pushes the button and a new screen pops up a user pushes the button again and another new screen pops up. This says nothing about the function being performed by actuation of the actuator as being dependent upon the location of a selector in one of a plurality of fields. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 18 in 20 should be withdrawn. Claims scratch that the rejection of claims 2-17 and 21 which depend from claims 1 and 20 should be withdrawn for the same reasons.

B. Claim 22

Claim 22 recite a time recording and management system including a plurality of fields configured to display different types of time entry data, a selector movable between each of the plurality of fields and a first actuator configured to automatically fill a data in at least two of the fields upon being actuated once.

Kahn fails to disclose a selector that is movable between each of a plurality of fields displaying time entry data and an actuator and is configured to automatically fill data in at least two of the fields upon being actuated once. In fact, the Office Action fails even address the limitation that a single actuation of the actuator results in two fields being automatically filled in with data. The portion of Kahn cited by the Office Action to reject all of claims 1, 13 count 15 come 18 and 20-23 says nothing to make this claim limitation. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 22 should be withdrawn. Rejection of claim 23, which depend from claim 22, should be withdrawn for the same reasons.

C. Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites that when the selector is positioned in the date field in the first actuator is actuated, the first actuator enters a current date in the date field, enters a current system time in the start field corresponding to the date field, enters the current system time plus a preselected time increment in the stop field corresponding to the start field and moves the selector to stop field corresponding to the start field.

Kahn fails to disclose they recited configuration of the actuator. First, Kahn says nothing about entering a current date in the date field or entering a current system time in the start field corresponding to the date field. Likewise, Kahn said nothing about entering the current system time plus a preselected time increment in the stop field corresponding to the start field.

In contrast, the portion cited in the Office Action (column 37, line 41-48) merely discloses adjusting the standard pay right by adding an increment of \$10 to the hourly pay rate. Applicant does not understand how adding \$10 to an hourly pay rate can somehow constitute entering the current system time. Obviously, the current system time cannot be a dollar value. Moreover, nowhere does Kahn disclose that its \$10 increment would be entered in the "effective date" field and the "expiration date" field of Figure 12(a) of Kahn which was previously characterized by the Office Action at the start field and the stop field. The Office Action appears to be mixing up its fields and hodgepodging completely different aspects of Kahn together based upon Applicants own disclosure as a blueprint in an attempt to read upon the limitations of the claims.

Furthermore, Kahn says nothing about moving the selector to the stop field corresponding to the start field in which the current system time was entered. Nowhere does Kahn say anything about the selector automatically moving to be "expiration date" field in response to actuation of an actuator while the selector is positioned in the date field. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 2 is improper and should be withdrawn.

D. Claim 3

Claim 3 depends from claim number one and recites at the first actuator enters a current system time in the start field when the selector is positioned in the start field.

Nowhere does Kahn disclose actuation of an actuator that enters a current system time in the start field when the selector is positioned in the start field. BKahnt is nothing ever about a current system time. Rather, Kahn time most, allows a user to key in any start date or is expiration date. Nowhere does Kahn disclose that the expiration date or the start date are current system times. Displaying any date is not the same as displaying the current system time. As one of ordinary skill in the art nose and as set forth in the specification come the current system time is a present time on the computer, not any old time that happens be stored in a database. Accordingly, rejection of claim three should be withdrawn.

E. Claim 4

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and recites at the first actuator reports a proceeding stop time in the start field when the selector is in the start field.

Kahn fails to disclose anything about actuation of an actuator that reports a proceeding stop time in the start field when the selector is in the start field. Nowhere does Ryne disclose that when the selector is in the start date field (characterized by the Office Action as the "start field", that actuation of an actuator causes the previous or proceeding stop time (i.e. "Expiration date" value of Kahn as characterized by the Office Action) to be entered in the same start field. This would make little sense. Column 13, line 58-67 relied upon in the office action disclose nothing about reporting a proceeding stop time in a start field when the selectors in the start field. Rather, as noted above, decided portion of Kahn merely discloses that a person may program the system to automatically proceed through a sequence of interface screens. Again, this is nothing about reporting a proceeding stop time in a start field when the selectors in the start field. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn.

F. Claims 5 and 6

Claim 5 depend from claim 1 and recites at the first actuator copies data from at least one code field of a first time entry truly swung corresponding: field of a second time entry upon actuation of the actuator.

Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and further recites that the actuator copies data from the description field of a first time entry to the description field of a second time entry upon actuation of the first actuator.

Kahn fails to disclose either of these limitations. In contrast, Kahn merely discloses automatically sequencing through a sequence of interface screens. Kahn says nothing about copying data from a code field or a description field of a first time entry to the code field or the description field of a second time entry. Once again, the "time entry" of Kahn, as characterized by the Office Action is the line of data in which the expiration date and the start date are found. As noted above, the Office Action fails to even allege that Ryne discloses such a code field. Furthermore, the Office Action fails to allege where Kahn presumably copies data from a code field or a description field of a first time entry to those field of a second time entry. Accordingly, claims 5 and 6 overcome the rejection.

G. Claim 10

Claim 10 depends from claim 1 and, as amended, recites an entry hours field configured to display elapsed time between a corresponding starting time and a corresponding ending time in the start field and the stop field, respectively.

Kahn is failed to disclose such limitations. Once again, in rejecting claim 1, the Office Action characterized the "effective date" field as the start field and the "expiration date" field as the stop field. Nowhere does Ryne disclose another field which displays an elapsed time between the values entered in the start field and the stop field (the effective date and expiration date of Kahn). In rejecting claim 10, the Office Action refers to several portions of Kahn. However, closer inspection of such portion reveals that none of these portions say anything about displaying an

elapsed time between a corresponding start time in a corresponding ending time from the noted fields. For example, column 14, line 44-64 merely discloses retrieving overtime hours. Retrieving overtime hours from a database is clearly not the same as displaying an elapsed time between a corresponding store time in a corresponding ending time. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 10 should be withdrawn.

H. Claim 14

Claim 14 depends from claim 10 and further recites a second actuator configured to some the elapsed time for all entries on a selected date upon being actuated.

Kahn fails to disclose the limitations of claim 14. In fact, the Office Action fails to even address the specific limitations of claim 14. None of the citations set forth in the rejection disclose anything about the limitations set forth in claim 14 wherein the elapsed time for all entries on a selected date are summed. Accordingly, rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

I. Claim 19

Claim 19, as amended, recites a time reporting and management system. The system includes means for automatically entering a universal time and a second one of the plurality of fields based upon the selected first one of the plurality of fields and in response to actuation of an actuator.

Ryan fails to disclose limitations of claim 19. Ryan says nothing about automatically entering a universal time in a distinct field based upon the field in which he selectors located at in response to actuation of an actuator. Decided portion set forth in the Office Action of Ryan do not disclose these limitations. Allowing a person to key and information is clearly not the same as automatically entering the Universal Time. Moreover, a date, such as for, for example, October 6, is not a "Universal Time". Rather, as known to those of ordinary skill in the art, they "Universal Time" is a time value such as 3:00 PM. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

II. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3815. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-3815. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-3815.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Oct. 8, 2007

By Todd A. Rathe

RATHE PATENT & IP LAW
Customer No. 59555
Telephone: (262) 478-9353
Facsimile: (262) 238-1469

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276